

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested. Applicant petitions for a two month extension of time to respond to the office action mailed November 20, 2007.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 28-32.

The examiner indicated claims 5-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable claim 3 and intervening claim 2. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled.

Allowable claim 8 has been rewritten as new independent claim 33, which includes all of the limitations of allowable claim 8, independent claim 1, and intervening claim 4.

Allowable claim 9 has been rewritten as new independent claim 34, which includes all of the limitations of allowable claim 9, independent claim 1, and intervening claim 4.

Allowable claim 14 has been rewritten as new independent claim 35, which includes all of the limitations of allowable claim 14 and independent claim 1.

Allowable claim 15 has been rewritten as new independent claim 36, which includes all of the limitations of allowable claim 15 and independent claim 1.

Allowable claim 17 has been rewritten as new independent claim 37, which includes all of the limitations of allowable claim 17, independent claim 1, and intervening claim 16.

Independent Claim 18 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable claim 22. Claim 22 has been canceled.

All claims now contain subject matter that the examiner indicated is allowable. Accordingly, all claims are in condition for allowance.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 16, 18-21, and 23, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,802,846 to Hauschild. Claims 5-7 and 12, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hauschild.


Applicant disagrees with the examiner's rejection of the claims. However, in view of the amendments and cancellation of claims 23-27, the rejections are moot and the Examiner should allow all pending claims.

**CONCLUSION**

The above is believed to be a complete response. In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants believe that all claims are now in condition for allowance and ask that these pending claims be allowed. The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues and/or informalities and expedite prosecution of this case

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2008

  
Fred C. Hernandez  
Reg. No. 41,832

**PTO Customer No. 64046**

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
5355 Mira Sorrento Place, Suite 600  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 320-3018  
Fax: (858) 320-3001  
Email: FHernandez@mintz.com